

JAF



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

RECEIVED

JUL 20 2004

H.E.W.M. LLP

HELLER EHRMAN WHITE & MCAULIFFE
275 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD
MENLO PARK CA 94025-3506

COPY MAILED

JUL 14 2004

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Jaime E. Ramirez-Vick et al.
Application No. 09/997,475
Filed: November 19, 2001
Attorney Docket No. 25527-0003 C1

DECISION ON PETITIONS
UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) AND
UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6)

This is a decision on the renewed petition filed June 18, 2004 which is being treated under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6), to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) for the benefit of the prior-filed nonprovisional and provisional applications set forth in the concurrently filed amendment.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) and 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(i) and 1.78(a)(5)(i) of the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

REVIEWED

The petition fails to comply with item (1) above.

37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(i) requires that any nonprovisional application claiming the benefit of one or more prior-filed copending nonprovisional applications must contain or be amended to contain a reference to each such prior-filed application, identifying it by application number (consisting of the series code and serial number) and indicating the relationship of the applications. The relationship between the applications is whether the subject application is a continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part of a prior-filed nonprovisional application. An example of a proper benefit claim is: "This application is a continuation of Application No. 10/---, filed---." A benefit claim that merely states: "This application claims the benefit of Application No. 10/---, filed---," does not comply with 37 CFR 1.72(a)(2)(i) since the proper relationship, which includes the type of continuing application, is not stated. Also, the status of each nonprovisional parent application (if it is patented or abandoned) should also be indicated, following the filing date of the parent nonprovisional application. See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, 8th ed., (August 2001), Section 201.11, Reference to First Application. The amendment filed June 18, 2004 does not clearly state the relationship of Application No. 10/029,113 to the instant application.

Accordingly, before the petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) can be granted, a renewed petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) and correction of the above matter is required.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Mail Stop Petition
 Commissioner for Patents
 Post Office Box 1450
 Alexandria, Va 22313-1450

By FAX: (703) 872-9306
 Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand: 2011 South Clark Place
 Crystal Plaza Two Lobby
 Room 1B03
 Arlington, VA 22202

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (703) 8859.

Karen Creasy

Karen Creasy
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy